

claims of the application.

Claims 7 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

While Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection, it is also believed the rejection has been obviated by the amendments made herein. In view thereof, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-3, 7-8 and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Shida et al. (U.S. Patent 6,060,207).

Claims 1-2, 7-8 and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Allen et al. (U.S. Patent 5,786,131).

Claims 1, 3, 7-8, and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Johnson et al. (SPIE paper).

While Applicants disagree with these Section 102 rejections, the new pending claims recite features of original claims 4 and 5, which claims were not rejected under Section 102. Accordingly, it is believed the rejections are properly withdrawn.

Claims 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Shida et al. (U.S. Patent 6,060,207).

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Shida et al. (U.S. Patent 6,060,207) in view of Goodall et al. (WO 97/33198).

Claims 1-4, 7-8 and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Goodall et al. (WO 97/33198).

For the sake of brevity, the three Section 103 rejections are addressed in combination. Each of the rejections is traversed.

In the Office Action, it is specifically acknowledged that Shida et al. does not teach a positive photoresist having a polymer with alkenyl substitution. In the Office Action, it is also admitted that Shida et al. does not disclose a resist having a polymer containing cycloalkyl groups of 3 or 4 ring carbon atoms.

For that reason alone, the rejections based on the Shida et al. document should be withdrawn.

① In the Office Action, a negative resist example of Shiba et al. is cited, which reports a copolymer of allyl methacrylate.

That disclosure of allyl methacrylate is not particularly pertinent here. First, as acknowledged in the Office Action, Siba et al. reports allyl methacrylate for use in a negative resist. Additionally, Applicants claim a positive resist having acid labile groups, wherein the acid-labile groups contain alkenyl group. The cited polymer of the Shiba et al. does not contain acid-labile groups. *It does.*

② Goodall is similarly deficient. Goodall is cited for a report of dicyclopropylmethyl. It is not seen that one would have any particular incentive to select that group out of the many possible alternatives as proposed by the instant rejection. Nor does Goodall provide any suggestion of an acrylate polymer. See new claims 23 and 28.

only 10 ex's
but is only limited to cl. 23 & 28

G. Taylor et al.
U.S.S.N. 09/330,418
Page 5

Applicants also can antedate the Goodall publication.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Peter F. Corless', written over the typed name.

Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
Dike, Bronstein, Roberts & Cushman IP Group
130 Water Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 523-3400